G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1906
(Mauzrai)

File No. 76

Serial Nos. 1 — 8

Papers Filed.

Month January 1908.

SUBJECT.

Appeal petition of Seshappa re the Archakship of the Ghate Basavanna temple at Sultanpet, in the Chikballapur Taluk

PREVIOUS REFERENCES	LATER REFERENCES

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

OFFICE NOTE

File No. 7-06

SUBJECT.

~~In re the~~ Appeal of Seshappa re the Archakship of the Ghat Basvanna temple at Sultanpet, in the Naad Hobli of the Chickballapur Taluk.

From

The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

No 116 Dated 26th April 1907.

From the extract of the Inam register and ~~the Deputy Commr's report~~, it is obs that the temples of Sri Kasivisweswaraswa Kundumalli
at ~~Kundumalli and~~ Ghat Basvanna (~~at Sultanpet and the temple of Sri Kasiviswesvaraswamy at Kundumalli in the Chickballapur Taluk~~ Sultanpet Kandigenahalli near Sultanpet and at

are muzrai institutions endowed with Inam lands but in the Dy Comr's letter it is stated that ~~Inam lands~~ The facts of the case have been clearly set forth in the Deputy Commr's letter It appears that one Nandagiriappa was performing puje in the three temples and was enjoying

The temples of Kasi Visweswara & Ghatti Basavanna at Sultanpet (~~Papers under disposal~~) are endowed with the lands in question, the temple at Kundumalli having also endowed with some Inam land

The Inam lands endowed to them After his death, the petitioner Seshappa was enjoying the Inam lands, performing Puje only in the Kasi-visweswaraswamy temple at Kudumalle. The enjoyment of the Inam lands of the 2 temples by Seshappa at Sultanpet without rendering any Service in them, having come to the notice of the then Deputy Commissioner Mr. K. P. Puttanna chetty in the course of a correspondence regarding the repairs to the Ghati Basvanna temple, further enquiry was made, the result being that the appointment of Seshappa to the Archakship ~~of the three temples~~ was considered unauthorized and full Survey assessment was ordered to be recovered from Seshappa for his unauthorized enjoyment of the Inam lands of the 2 temples at Sultanpet. Thereupon Mr. K. P. Puttanna chetty ordered that the Archakship of the temples at Sultanpet be made in the name of Mallesiah, a gam by caste (who had been doing

one mallesiah was doing puja in the other 2 temples

(Slip A)

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

~~worship~~ puje), that the Inam lands of these temples which were then in the enjoyment of Seshappa, be transferred to Mallesiah ~~possession~~; that Mallesiah should contribute towards the repair of the Ghati Basvanna temple, that Seshappa should pay up Rs 48/- being the arrears of assessment on the Inam lands of the Ghati Basvanna and Kasiviswesvaraswamy temples at Sultanpet, for the past 3 years, and that in the event of his failure to abide by the orders, he should not be allowed to do puje in the Kasi Viswesvaraswamy temple at Kudevatti also.

Seshappa has appealed to Govt against the foregoing orders

(Slip B) The grounds of his appeal are:—

1) That worship in the Ghati Basvanna

temple was being done according to Brahmanic Agamas and as such, the appointment of Mallesiah is opposed to Manual and Sastras.

2) That as agreed upon by Nandagiriappa (and the Villagers), he had been appointed to the Archakship in the year Plava; that Inam lands bearing Survey no. 63 belonging to the Ghati Basavanna temple was in his possession and that no Archak had been appointed to this temple. He prays that he may be restored to the Archakship of the Basavanna temple and the Inam lands endowed thereto and also that a date may be fixed for hearing him in person and the same intimated to him.

In his depositions and the mutchalika before the Amildar (Slips C & D) received with the Deputy Commrs. reports

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

he has admitted that there is no relationship between him and Vandagiriappa, the original Archak, and has stated that the Archakship of the 3 temples in question and the Inam lands endowed thereto were in the enjoyment of Vandagiriappa's family, that as Vandagiriappa was not doing Puje properly, he (the appellant) was appointed to the Archakship of the Kudevalli temple; that Vandagiriappa has no heirs to succeed him; and that he has been doing Puje for the past 3 years and enjoying the Inam lands belonging to the 3 temples. He further states that during Vandagiriappa's grand-father's ~~time~~ time, about the year 1884, when the village belonged to the Devadurga Taluka, some Lingayets having performed

GPB—3,000—22-6-06

6

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

Puje in the Basvanna temple, the question of worship was then under correspondence, and it was directed that Lingayets should not perform Puje in the Basvanna temple-(No correspondence supporting this statement has been received). He further represents that the Inam land of the Kudumallé temple is barren, that he utilized the income of the Inam lands of the 3 temples for services &c. and as such he should not be held liable for the payment of the arrears of assessment, as ordered by the Deputy Commissioner. With respect to this point, the Amildar reports that Seshappa was new to the ~~appointment~~ place, that ~~the income from the Inam lands was utilized for the benefit of the temple and as such it may not be recovered from him~~ he is unable to pay the assessment which was demanded to be recovered from him — (Slip E

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

As regards the appointment of Seshappa in the year Plava as alleged by him, and Puje in the Basvanna temple according to Agamas, it is reported that there (Paper under disposal) is nothing on record to support these Mallesiah, to whose possession the Inam of the temples at Sultanpet have since been restored and who has executed a lika to conduct worship regularly, state that the Archakship of the Basvanna temple was being done by the members of his family since the time of his grand-father, but it is reported that no proof has been adduced as to the genuineness of his statement.

Regarding the repairs to the temple which originated this an estimate for Rs 96/ has been with the Vernacular records. One C

GPB—3,000—22-6-06

Narasimha Maistry of Sultanpet has agreed to pay Rs 50/ towards the repair, (Slips 6 & 11 before the Deputy Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioner and has executed a Muchalika on the 14th October 1909, to the effect that if a sum of Rs 48/ be paid from Govt he would execute the repairs himself As ordered by the Deputy Commissioner, a sum of Rs 50/ is reported to have been recovered from Mallesiah, towards the repairs to the institution. The Deputy Commr is silent on this point, the reason perhaps being that a report was called for on the appeal of Seshappa re the Puje Hak of the Basvanna temple.

It is respectfully submitted that with respect to a gratuitous enjoyment by one Sarvakaramat a

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

may a date be fixed for the hearing of the case—?

Submd
DS
11/5/07

Yes. Post to 13th July, Saturday. Issue notices to all parties concerned.

11/5/07

Notices Submitted.
AG 17/5/07.

The file is submd to the 2nd Jt for perusal. The hearing is on Saturday next.

Chandralamba
Mysore 11/7/07

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.



P.T.O

MGCPB—2,500—1-8-05.

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

2nd Councillor's Remarks:-

The parties Seshappa and Mallesiah were present.* The respondent Mallesiah was represented by Advocate Mr. Murti Rao. The appellant Seshappa stated that there was no Kasiviswes-wara temple at Nandi Ghat Sultanpet and that -- there was only one temple at the place viz that of Basavanna. He however admitted the fact of his having unauthorizedly enjoyed the Inam land endowed to the Basavanna temple without rendering any service therein. He contended that there was only one Inam land in the joint names of the Basavanna temple at Kuduvatti, and that he was enjoying it on the ground that he was performing puje in the latter institution. He admitted the facts that he was in no way related to the hakdar Archak Nandagiriappa who died a few years ago leaving no male varasdar and that Mallesiah was doing puja in the Basavanna temple without any remuneration.

The revised Quitrent Register corrected,

* on 13" July 1907. GH

at Sultanpet and the Kasiviswesvara temple

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

upto the 30th June 1901 clearly shews that there are two separate Inam lands, one endowed to Kasiviswes-wara temple at Kuduvatti and the other to the Kasi-visweswara and the Basavanna temples near Sultanpet. It is but fair that the person who actually does ser-vice, ought to enjoy the Inam land set apart for the purpose. Mallesiah was rightly put into possession of the Inam land endowed to the 2 temples at the -- Nandi Ghat because he was doing puje therein.

I therefore see no reason to interfere with the orders passed by the Deputy Commissioner. The appeal may accordingly be rejected.

As regards the recovery of full ass-essment on the Inam land unauthorizedly enjoyed by the appellant Seshappa, as ordered by the Deputy -- Commissioner, the Amildar reports that Seshappa is too poor to pay the amount viz., Rs. 48/-. The levy of the assessment will under the circumstances be waived.

13-7-1907

MGCPB—2,500—1-8 05.

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

31/19.7.07 As this is an appeal against my own order, the file will be submitted to the Dewan for his orders.

MRN
19/7/07

15
Subd to the Dewan
55-02
19.7.07

EL
19/7/07 Jagree with the decision
22/8/1907

Subd to the 2nd Councillor for perusal.

EL
22/8/07

Seen
MRN
22/8/07

Draft accepted EL
24/8/07

AL

Dft submitted.
AV
24/8/07

File No.	of 190	Muzrai Secretar

MGCPB—2,500—1-8-05.

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note continued

Orders rejecting the appeal of Kanhalli Seshappa in regard to the Archakship of the Ghats Basvanna and Kasi Visweswara Swamy temples at Sultanpet in the Chick-ballapur Taluk were accordingly issued in Govt Ccu. no 2524-5 Dy 28th November 1907.

Seshappa has petitioned the Dewan praying for a re-consideration of the orders of Govt He complains that the order appealed against by him has been passed by the then Dy. Commr., Mr. K S Puttanna Chetty who as Councillor (in charge of Muzrai Portfolio) heard him and passed orders. With reference to this complaint, it is respectfully submitted that the papers in this case were before the Dewan who concurred in the Councillor's decision.

Submitted with a draft endorsement rejg the present appeal

Issue 19/1/08 11/1/08

GPB—3,000—22-6-06

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಎಸ್‌ಡಿಎ/ಎಸ್‌ಎಲ್‌ಆರ್/ಸಿಆರ್-೧೦೨/೨೦೦೬-೦೭ ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೩೦-೦೮-೨೦೦೬

ಇವರಿಗೆ,

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಪ್ರಕಾಶ್,
ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು,
ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು ಉಪವಿಭಾಗ,
ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು.

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ವಿಷಯ: ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಕಸಬಾ ಹೋಬಳಿ, ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. ೪೫ರ ೧೨.೦೦ ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಸಕ್ರಮೀಕರಣ ಕೋರಿ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಮ್ಮ ಕೋಂ ದಿವಂಗತ ಗೋವಿಂದಪ್ಪ ಇವರಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿ.

ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ: ತಮ್ಮ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಎಸಿ/ಸಿಕೆಎಂ/ಭೂಮಿ/೨೦೨೪-೨೫/೦೩೭ ದಿನಾಂಕ ೧೨-೦೯-೨೦೨೪.

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯ ಮತ್ತು ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿತ ಪತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ, ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಕಸಬಾ ಹೋಬಳಿ, ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. ೪೫ರ ೧೨.೦೦ ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಸಕ್ರಮೀಕರಣ ಕೋರಿ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಮ್ಮ ಕೋಂ ದಿವಂಗತ ಗೋವಿಂದಪ್ಪ ಇವರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೋರಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಯ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ಬಾಕಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ, ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನು ಅತಿಕ್ರಮಣ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಎಸಿ/ಒತ್ತು/೦೪೨/೨೦೦೫-೦೬ ಅನ್ನು ದಿನಾಂಕ ೨೨-೧೦-೨೦೦೬ರಂದು ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥಪಡಿಸಿ, ಅತಿಕ್ರಮಣದಾರರಿಗೆ ತಲಾ ೧೦ ಗುಂಟೆಯಂತೆ ೧೨ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಒಟ್ಟು ೧೨೦ ಗುಂಟೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸಕ್ರಮಗೊಳಿಸಿ ಆದೇಶಿಸಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ, ಸದರಿ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೊಳಿಸಿ ಪೋಡಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅತಿಕ್ರಮಣದಾರರು ಮುಂದಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಪೈಕಿ ೧೨.೦೦ ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸಕ್ರಮಗೊಳಿಸಿಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಕೋರಿ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಮ್ಮ ಕೋಂ ದಿವಂಗತ ಗೋವಿಂದಪ್ಪ ಇವರು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು ೨೫ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಕೃಷಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರ ಪತಿ ದಿವಂಗತ ಗೋವಿಂದಪ್ಪ ಅವರು ಸಹ ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು ಎಂದು ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರು ದೃಢೀಕರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ಬಾಕಿ ಇಲ್ಲದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರ ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲು ಕೋರಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ,

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರ ಕಚೇರಿ
ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು ಉಪವಿಭಾಗ

Sl 2

Misc. 1 A]

190

From

To

The Dy Commr.
Kolar Distt.

Dated

Despatched 21st June 1907

Received

Journal No. 3243

Enclosure No. Circle 12

Has the hnor to forwards herewith petition registered no. 2378 dated 9th November 1906, from Seshappa of Kanahalli, in the Devanahalli Tk, ~~re~~ appealing against the Dy Commrs. order re the Archakship of the Basvanna Temple at Kudumalli in the —

C.P.B.—5,000—21-7-08

Malur Taluk
of the Kolar Distt.

2) the Dy. Commr. is requested to submit a detailed report on all the points touched in the appeal together with the Govt. records relating thereto.

By order,

19/12/06

Secretary.

No. 3274

Dft) Sd

Mot. To the petr.

Sd
18/12/06

S13

1906-07

Av

4357

23-3-07

Rupees

21

23/3/07

From C. Srikanteswara Aiyangar BA BL
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar Dist

To

The Secretary to the Govt of
H H The Maharaja of Mysore
Mysore Residency

Dated
Despatched 22nd March 1907
Received

General No. 6761
No. 348

Enclosure No.

Reports on the appeal
petn of Seshappa of Kara-
halli in Devanhalli Taluk
in re the architects
of the Ghati Basavanna
Temple at Sultanpet
in the Nandi Hobli, Chick-
ballapur Taluk.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner.

Kolar District.

Dated Kolar, 19th March 1907.

From

C.Srikantesvara Aiyar Esquire, B.A., B.L.,

Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.

To

L. Anantasami Rao Esquire, B.A.,

Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

Muzrai Department.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 3273 dated the 24th December 1906, fprwarding for report petition of one Seshappa of Karahalli in the Devanahalli Taluk, appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's order re the Archikship of the Ghati Basavanna temple at Sultanpet, in the Nandi hobli , Chikballapur Taluk, I have the honor to state as follows:-

2. The templesof Kasi Visveswaraswami and Ghati Basavanna at Sultan pet are endowed with Inam lands Survey No. 63 measuring 9ac 35gs assessed at Rs. 16/- in the village of Kuduvatti.

3. Formerly the puja of the above temples was being performed by one Nandagiriappa of Kuduvatti, who is also the Archik of Sri Kasi Vesvavaraswami temple at Kuduvatti endowed with an Inam land survey No. 170 measuring 3ac 1gunta assessed at Rs. 4-8-0.

4. Nandagiriappa was performing puja in the three temples and was enjoying the Inam lands endowed to them. After the death of Nandagiriappa, the petitioner Seshappa was enjoying the said Inam Lands , performing puja only in the Kasi Visvesvaraswami templa at Kuduvatti. The enjoyment of the Inam lands of Kasi Visvesvara and Ghati Basavann temples by Seshappa without performing puja in these temples, having come to the notice of the then Deputy Commissioner, Mr. K.P. Puttanna Chetty in the course of a correspondence with regards to the repairs of Ghati Basavanna temple, further enquiry was ordered to be held in the matter. The result of the enquiry was that the appointment of Seshappa to the Archikship of the three temples was considered unau

rized, and full survey assessment on the Inam lands assigned to the temples of Kasi Visvesvaraswami and Ghati Basavanna was ordered to be recovered from him for the three years he had been in possession.

5. Thereupon Mr. K.P.Puttanna Chetty ordered that the Archikship of Ghati Basavanna and Kasi Visvesvaraswami temples at Sultanpet be made in the name of one Mallesiah, a Jangama by caste, that the Inam lands that was being unauthorisedly enjoyed by Seshappa, be transferred to his (Mallesiah) possession, that Seshappa should pay the arrears of assesment, and in the event of his failurcto pay up the arrears, he should not be allowed to perform puja in the Kasi Visvesvaraswami temple at Kuduvatti also.

6. Against this order the petitioner has appealed to Government.

7. The allegation of the petitioner that he was appointed to the Archikship in the year Plava is untenable, as there is nothing on record to show that such an appointment was ordered.

8. With regard to the contention of the petitioner that the puja in the Ghati Basavanna temple was being done in accordance with the Brahmanic Agamas, it has been reported that no evidence is forthcoming to that effect.

9. As regards the statement of Mallesiah that the puja of the Basava in question was being done by the members of his family since the time of his grand-father, no proof has been adduced as to the genuineness of his statement.

10. The only ground on which the petitioner basis his claim to the Archikship of the temples at Sultanpet is, that as the Archik of the Kuduvatti Kasi Visvesvaraswami temple was performing puja and enjoying the Inam lands endowed to the temple at Sultanpet from a long time, the same hak may also be continued to him.

11. The file of vernacular papers ending with the Chikballapur Sub Division Officer's yadi No. 911 together with the enclosures to your docket under reply, is herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

For Deputy Commissioner.
Kolar District.

Dft. for approval

814

Mus. I A]

190

From

To The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore,

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Has the honor to request that extracts of the Inam register pertaining to the grant of Inam lands in the village of Kudureatti endowed to the Sri Kasi Visweswaraswamy and Ghati Basvanna at Sultanpet in the Nandi Hobli of the Chick-ballapur Taluk and also to the Sri Kasiviseweswara Swamy temple at Kudureatti

GPB—8,000—21-7-03

may be forwarded to this office, for reference.

By order,

sd/ [illegible]

Secretary

ks
6/4/07

S15

1907

From The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore, Inam Department

Dated 26th

Despatched 27th April 1907

Received

General No. 116

No.

Enclosure No. (one)

As requested in his docket No. 485-9 dated 11th April 1907, has the honor to forward herewith, a copy of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of lands to Sri Kasi Visweswara Devaru at Kudurathi and Basavanna devaru at Sultanpet in the Chikkaballapur Taluk.

Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

Hc

4942

29.4.07

Papers

Rs

29/4/07

AV

Please put up a note

4/5/07

office noted overleaf

8/5/07

Register Sheet No. 348

Village — Koodoovathi

Hobli — Nandi

Taluk — Chickaballapoora

Copy of the Register of Inams in the village of Koodoovattu —— in the

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No and name of field or fields comprised in the grant Dry, wet or garden	Extent Local measure Even where the local measure is in acres, gunts, and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Extent Measure in acres and their fractions in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
Title deed no 239			As per Jarvy Account 1801	
2	Devadaya	Dry no: 59	6 Cood = 3.97	
			Pymaish 1801 21720 Sq.yds. = 4.49	
			Pymaish 1860 43560 Sq.yds = 9.00	

Sammat of Nandi in the Taluk of Chickaballapoora

		DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND	
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, etc, whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc., or liable to quit-rent, *i. e.*, jodi, etc., amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the raiyats to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7			
6	7	8	9
0-7-4		For poojay to Kasi Visweswara-dever at Koodavati and Basavanna dever at Nandi Ghat Services rendered. Temples in good order.	Free.

DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE INAM

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, etc., and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given
10	11
	One Takeed of 1834 from Amildar for the produce of the Inam-

of Tolai ____

NAME AND RELATION-SHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poonmah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
	Jaffna Accounts 1801	1832
	Basavanna and Kasivisweraswamy As in Col: 11	6 Coorg 36 fams.

of the

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner If the inam has been subdivided, the name, etc, of each sharer should be entered in the columns

Residence, name and age, etc	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Koodavati Kasi Visveswaraswamy. At Nandi Ghat near Sultanpet. Ghati Basavamma Inam is Enjoyed by Poojaries 1. Nandeeswariah ½ 2. Papatchiamma ¼ 3. Monniappa ¼			

Division

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

stract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam Assistant's opinion and recommendation.	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner
19	20
he inam is entered in the rents as belonging to the ears in col - 15, and the me is confirmed by the ued entered in col - 11 To be confirmed, so long services are performed e — (Signed) Narasimmiengar 20-7-71 Asst.	To be confirmed and continued free of tax (Initd.) B. Gopaliah 17-3-72. Spl: Asst. confirmed (Signed) Robert Cole 26-6-72 Inam Supdt.

"Copy"

Inam Supdt's Office,
ngalore D/ 26th/27th Apl: 1907.

Superintendent of Inam Settlements &c

GPB—1,000 books of 2 sheets each—9-8-06.

Dft as per Dewan's order

Mysore

516

25/11

Read,

Petition registered no 2378

dated 9th November 1906 from Seshappa of Kanahalli in the Devanahalli Taluk appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr of the Kolar District regarding the trusteeship of the Ghati Basvanna temple at Sultanpet, in the Nandi Hobli, Chickballapur Taluk

Letter no 6461/348 dated 22nd March 1904 from the Deputy Commr of the Kolar District, reporting on the above

Docket no 116 dated 26th April 1904 from the Supdt of Inam Settlements in Mysore forwarding an extract of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of Inam lands to the tem of Sri Kasiviswesvara D

at Kudumalli and Basavanna
swamy at Sultanpet in the
Chickballapur Taluk.

Order thereon No. Dated.

~~From the extract of the~~
Inam Register it is observed
that the temples of Kudumalle
Sri Kasiviswesvaraswamy
~~at Nandigherst near Sultanpet~~
and Ghati Basavanna at
Sultanpet are muzrai insts.
~~endowed with Inam lands, but~~
~~The~~ The Dy Commr's letter
read above, it is stated that
the temples of Kasi Visweswara
and Ghati Basavanna at ⁂ Survey no 63 - 9-35 — Rs 16/-
Sultanpet and the temple of × — no — 140 — 3-1 — Rs 4-8-
Sri Kasiviswesvaraswamy
at Kudumalli are endowed with
~~the~~ Inam lands as noted
in the margin. The Dy Commr
reports that one Nandagiriappa
was performing puje in the
three temples and was enjoying
the Inam lands endowed
them. After his death,

The appellant Seshappa was
enjoying all the Inam lands above mentioned
performing Puje only in the
Kasi Visweswara swamy the
temple at Kudumatti and one
Mallesiah was doing Puje
in the other two temples.
The unauthorised enjoyment of the Inam
lands of the two temples
at Sultanpet by Seshappa
without rendering any
Service in them, having come
to the notice of the then
Dy. Commr Mr K. S Puttanna
Chetty, in the Course of
a Correspondence regarding
the repairs to the Ghati
Basavanna temple, further
enquiry was made, with the
result ~~being~~ that the ap
pointment of Seshappa
to the Archakship was
considered unauthorized and
full Survey assessment
was ordered to be recovered
from Seshappa for his
unauthorized en
of the Inam

of the 2 temples at Sultanpet
It was further directed by the
~~Thereupon Mr. K. S. Sastriar~~
~~Deputy Commissioner~~ Deputy Commissioner
~~clearly ordered~~ that the
Archakship of the temples
at Sultanpet should be made in
the name of Mallesiah,
who has been conducting
worship, that the Inam
lands of the temples
which were then in the enjoyment
of Seshappa be transferred
to Mallesiah; ~~that Venkatesa~~
~~Shanbhogue contribute towards~~
~~the repairs of the Ghati~~
~~Basavanna temple~~; that
Seshappa should pay up
Rs 48/- being
the arrears of assessment
~~for Rs 48/-~~ on the Inam
lands of the temples at
Sultanpet for the past 3
years; and that in the
event of his failure to
abide by the orders, he
should not be allowed
to do puje in the Kudumalli
temple also.

2. Against the fore-going

orders Seshappa has appea to Govt.

3. The parties Seshappa and Mallesiah were heard by the II Councillor on the 13th July last. The respondent Mallesiah was represented by Advocate Mr. Murti Rao. The appellant Seshappa states that there was no Kasiviseveswara temple at Ramighat, Sultanpet, and that there was only one temple at the place viz that of Basavanna. He however admitted the fact of his having unauthorizedly enjoyed the Inam land endowed to the Basvanna temple without rendering any service therein. He contended that there was only one Inam land in the joint names of the Basvanna temple at Sultanpet and the

viswesvara temple at
Kudumatti, and that he
was enjoying it on the
ground that he was -
performing puje in the
latter institution. He
admitted the fact that
he was in no way -
related to the kaladar
Archak Nanjagiriappa
who died a few years
ago leaving no male
varasdar and that Mallesiah
was doing puje in the
Basvanna temple without
any remuneration.

4. The revised quit-rent
Register corrected up to
the 30th June 1901 clearly
shows that there are
two separate Inam
lands, one endowed to
the Kasiviswesvara temple
at Kudumatti and the
other to the Kasi Viswesvara
and the Basvanna temples

near Sultanpet ~~Harbour~~

5. The Govt. observe that it is but fair that the person who actually does service, ought to enjoy the Inam lands set apart for the purpose and that Mallesiah was rightly put into possession of the Inam land endow to the two temples at the Nandi Ghat because he was doing Puja therein

In these circumstances, the Govt. see no reason to interfere with the orders passed by the Dy. Commr. The appeal is accordingly rejected.

6. As regards the of full assessment on the Inam lands unauthorizedly enjoyed by the appellant Seshappa, as ordered by the Dy.

Amildar reports that

Seshappa is too poor

to pay the amount viz Rs 4 8 ℔

The levy of the assessment
from him
will under the circum-
stances be waived.

Note
This may be
granted
up

Dewan's order) 25/11/07
Secretary.

AD 28/8/07 Mug Dept
up 29/8/07

To,

The Dy. Commr. Kolar

Dist returning the Vern
records.

The Supdt of Inam Settlements
in Mysore G.O.D.S. 916
Encl to the Peta.

Muz. 21]

ನಂ.

ಮೈಸೂರು ಶ್ರೀಮತ್ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ

[illegible]

[illegible]

ನೀವು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಜಾಹಿರ್ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ [illegible] ಮೊಹ ೧ ನೇ

ಮತ್ತು ೨೩೭೪ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಅರ್ಜಿ ~~ಪರಾಂಬರಿಸಲಾಗಿತು.~~ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

GPB—1,000—26-9-07

MYSORE ... MUZRAI SECRT
MYSORE GOVT ... MUZRAI SECRT

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 63 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 2526 28-11-07 / 6-12-07 [illegible]

[illegible] 16-12-07 [illegible]

[illegible] 3-1-08 [illegible]

[illegible]

nz. 21]

518

ಮೈಸೂರು ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗವರ್ನ್ಮೆಂಟ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ

[illegible]

[illegible]

ನೀವು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಜಾಹಿರ್ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ [illegible] ಮಾಹೆ ೮ ನೇ

ಮರ್ಸ್ಕಂ ೨೭೭೪ ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಪರಾಂಬರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು—

[illegible] 2524 [illegible]

[illegible]

By order

DO Secretary 19/1/08

Copy to the Dy. Commr., Kolar Dist. in contn. of Govt. Pro. No 2524-5 dt 28-11-07.

By order
DO Secretary

GPB—1,000—26-9-07